Can the GOP Campaign As A Peace Party—on The Brink at Suez? See Page 4

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 35 SEPTEMBER 17, 1956 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

On Integration Ike Turns Morally Neutralist

Neutralism has been made a dirty word in American politics. Both parties are against it. We are constantly being treated to homilies from the White House and the State Department on the wickedness of being morally neutralist. But apparently these high principles only apply to disputes between the U.S. (right) and the U.S.S.R. (wrong), in which Pandit Nehru (by refusing to take our side) demonstrates incorrigibility.

The President at press conference the other day delivered himself of an impromptu message on integration which was afterward filmed and is being shown in the movie houses. Mr. Eisenhower deplored the extremists "on both sides." We weren't hearing the people of good will in the South. "We hear the people who are adamant . . . they even resort to violence," he said, "and the same way on the other side of the thing, the people who want to have the whole matter settled today."

If we stop and translate this into realities, we will see that the President is adopting at home the moral neutralism he deplores abroad. Let us turn to Clay, Kentucky. There last week a mob of white miners and farmers massed near the Clay elementary school to prevent any Negroes from entering. These were the "adamant people" to whom the President referred. Several school days in a row they turned back a lone Negro woman who tried to enter her son of ten and her daughter of eight. Mrs. Louis Gordon finally gave up, and sent her children to an all Negro school six miles away. "I just couldn't continue to take them out there every day," she told reporters. "They were in too much danger." Mrs. Gordon is one of those people whom Mr. Eisenhower described as "on the other side of the thing, the people who want to have the whole matter settled today."

Right and Wrong Were Never Simpler

We would like someone to ask the President how he can take that mob and that one brave Negro mother, and lump them together as "extremists." The mob opposes enforcement of the law; the woman asks for her children the benefit of the Supreme Court's decree. By any standard, isn't the mob wrong and the woman right? Isn't Mr. Eisenhower's attitude "moral neutralism" of a real and obnoxious variety?

Is it fair to speak of Mrs. Gordon as wanting "the whole matter settled today?" Isn't this an invidious way to describe what is happening? The Supreme Court decision is three years old. Unless her children are admitted "today", i.e. at the beginning of this year's school term, they must wait another year. And another year means, for them, as for many colored children in the South, another year of travelling a long extra way from home to school. "Six miles away" is 12 extra miles of travel daily, no small matter for children of eight and ten. Do they walk or ride? And if they ride, who pays their fare? These are bread and butter questions in most Negro homes.

Mr. Eisenhower says we aren't hearing the people of good will in the South. Their voice is not heard because the same mob spirit which overwhelms the Negro also cows them into silence. If the President is afraid to speak clearly, what can they (themselves a minority) say with the mob outside? This is what Adlai Stevenson meant when he told the Liberal Party in New York last week that it was the President's duty to create "a climate of compliance." This was what Adlai courageously was trying to create when he told a hostile, often booing, American Legion in Los Angeles the week before that we could not convince other nations that we believe in justice "when mobs prevent Negro children from lawfully attending school."

No Persuasion Without Some Force

We were sorry Adlai had to spoil his Liberal Party speech by invoking that double-talk from the Democratic platform about rejecting "all proposals for the use of force to interfere with the orderly determination of these matters by the courts." There will be no orderly determination without some show of force. A false dichotomy has been set up about force and persuasion. Both are needed. Neither can succeed without the other. But mobs can never be merely persuaded. They will overwhelm the good people of the community unless dealt with firmly. What progress has been made in Kentucky and Tennessee was made because Governors Chandler and Clement to their credit called out the militia to show that they meant business. And both Governors were able to act because of the political realities in these border states, which differ sharply from the deep South in two ways. The Negro votes in Kentucky and Tennessee. Both have a two party system.

In the one party deep South, where the Negro if he votes at all has no real choice, integration has not made a dent. All those fancy compilations only hide the fact that outside of the western fringe of Texas, which is more western than Southern, the only progress is in the border States. Everywhere from Virginia on, the South is preparing to nullify the law, to resist it, and there are too few places where Negroes have been able even to file suit. Unless some firm moves toward enforcing compliance are soon made from Washington, the lines may harden for a long, long fight in which the South, its destiny and its good people, will more and more come under the control of the worst elements and poison the political life of the whole country. Behind the school struggle is the shadow of a conflict as grave as slavery created. The South must either become truly democratic, or the base of a new racist and Fascist movement which could threaten the whole country and its institutions. On this, more than any other issue, fresh leadership in the White House is urgent.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some Questions the New York Post and the Washington Post Might Look Into

What *Did* J. Edgar Hoover Tell Truman About Harry White?

When Mr. Truman was in Milwaukee earlier this month he appeared on a local TV panel. One of the participants was an Anthony T. Bouscaren, head of the political science department at Marquette University. Bouscaren baited the former President about Hiss, Harry White and Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, and Mr. Truman—being a fighter—rose to the occasion by defending them. He said he did not think Hiss was a Communist spy, and he said of White and Silvermaster "neither one of them were guilty of anything."

The result was a shower of editorial brickbats for Mr. Truman. The silliest comment was that of the New York *Daily News,* which wanted to know whether Stevenson if elected would "perchance pay off part of his political debt to Truman by getting Alger Hiss another State Department job." Two liberal papers joined in. The *Washington Post* (Sept. 6) commented, "About all Mr. Truman can accomplish is to start charges flying again, embarrass his party and demonstrate what extraordinary blinders are worn by a man who in other matters has been capable of great vision." The *New York Post* (Sept. 5) took a similar tone, saying that all Mr. Truman had done was to give "Republican essayists the chance to rehearse all the weary old arguments of the McCarthy era."

Why The Silence on White?

We believe both these liberal papers have been hasty in their comments. Both spoke only of Hiss. Neither mentioned White and Silvermaster, though some readers of the *New York Post* will think these two men were included in its criticism of Mr. Truman for "his reluctance to believe that real Communists could conceivably invade government posts." Hiss at least had his day in court, but the departed White and the still very much alive Silvermaster were never found guilty of anything.

The papers in their rush to condemn Mr. Truman overlooked something new that he revealed on that panel about the White case. (The text of the interview may be found in the Sept. 14 issue of *U.S. News and World Report*). When Mr. Truman said White and Silvermaster were not guilty of anything, Bouscaren came back with, "J. Edgar Hoover apparently thought that Harry Dexter was engaged in espionage."

A New Revelation

Mr. Truman interrupted, "No, he didn't; he never told me that. And I was talking to him," Mr. Truman said, "just like I talk to you and he wouldn't answer that—" Here Bouscaren interrupted with "He so stated in his letter to General Vaughan." Mr. Truman insisted, "No, he didn't say any such thing."

Now this is the first time Mr. Truman ever said that he discussed the charges against Harry White face to face with J. Edgar Hoover. Bouscaren interrupted before the ex-President could say more. Perhaps the editors of the *New York Post* or the *Washington Post* will ask Mr. Truman now to tell the whole story.

But in the meantime there may be a clue in the Hoover letter to Vaughan. This was the famous letter Hoover wrote November 8, 1945, the day after he first heard Elizabeth Bentley's story, the letter Attorney General Brownell made public on November 12, 1953, before the Senate Internal Security Committee to back his "twenty years of treason" campaign.

If the editors will examine the text of the letter (at page 1113 of Part 16 of the Internal Security Committee's series of hearings on "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments"), they will see that Mr. Hoover wrote of White, Silvermaster and the other government employes named, "At the present time it is impossible to determine exactly how many of these people had actual knowledge of the disposition being made of the information" Bentley claimed she collected from them and transmitted to the Russians. Mr. Hoover added that he was continuing "vigorous investigation for the purpose of establishing the degree and nature of the complicity of these people in this espionage ring."

If Mr. Truman spoke face to face with Mr. Hoover about the charges against White, Mr. Hoover—judging by this letter—was not prepared to accuse White of espionage. The FBI had not determined whether White knew what use was being made of information allegedly obtained from him, nor had it determined "the degree and nature of the complicity." This may throw some light on why Mr. Truman did not fire White and also why the FBI failed to get an indictment against any of the people named in that report.

Three Who Gave Bentley The Lie

But there is stronger and newer support for Mr. Truman. Until now it has been assumed that those named by Miss Bentley pleaded the Fifth either to avoid confessing or to avoid prosecution for perjury if they denied her charges. It was also assumed that the government could not prosecute until it could force the accused to relinquish the Fifth.

This year three of those accused by Miss Bentley as part of the White ring have denied her charges under oath. William Henry Taylor was cleared by a government loyalty board in January after he swore that the Bentley charges were untrue. V. Frank Coe waived the Fifth amendment before the Senate Internal Security Committee on May 15 to testify, "I was never a spy. I am convinced that Harry White was not a spy. . . . I am also convinced that none of the others named by Bentley were spies."

Most important of all was the six days of testimony by William Ludwig Ullmann before a Federal grand jury in New York between May 23 and May 31. Ullmann was supposed with Silvermaster to have photographed secret documents for Miss Bentley. He was the first man granted immunity under the Immunity Act. He was compelled to testify—and he not only denied espionage but denied that he was ever a member of the Communist Party. Yet in the intervening months the grand jury has taken no action against him.

No indictments for perjury have been obtained against Ullmann, Coe or Taylor. Directly challenged at last by direct denials under oath, the government has quietly turned tail and backed away. Has it so little faith in Miss Bentley's story? Or did the grand jury hear her again, and remain as unimpressed as its predecessors from 1946 on?

The Bentley story is ready to fall part and with it the Brownell "20 years of treason" myth. Why shouldn't liberal papers join Mr. Truman in counter-attacking?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Sensational Interview Which Deserves Wider Attention

Cain Now Believes Subversive Activities Control Board Unconstitutional

On Friday, August 30, former Senator Harry Cain handed down his decision as hearing officer in the Washington Pension Union case, his last official act as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. He ruled that within the terms of the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Pension Union was a Communist front and subject to registration as "subversive" with the Board.

On Sunday, September 2, the *Washington Star* published a sensational interview with Mr. Cain which was not merely an apologia for that decision but marked a complete break on his part with the Board. As the reader will see from the excerpts below, Mr. Cain for the first time declared it his conviction that the Internal Security Act was unconstitutional.

Since the Supreme Court at this term may finally pass on the constitutionality of the Act, the Cain interview was a major piece of news but attracted little attention. It reflected the agony with which the SACB maverick did his duty as he saw it in the Pension Union case.

"Every day that passed," the *Washington Star* reported, "made him feel more like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. As a Government official he was duty bound to apply the law to the Pension Union. But as a thoughtful American he felt the organization posed no threat to the nation's security and thus did not merit the severe penalties which now hang over it."

Purposes Need Not Be Bad

The Pension Union was organized in the State of Washington in 1937. Cain found that it came into existence "as a result of a desire on the part of many people in the State of Washington for liberalized social security, particularly old age assistance," that it brought about many useful changes in the social security laws of the State and "rendered substantial assistance to pensioners and claimants." But he also found that it had been a faithful sounding board of Communist party line, notably in its Hitler-Stalin pact shifts during World War II. He found that Charles H. Fisher, its president since October, 1953, was not a Communist and that there was no evidence the Pension Union had been used for unlawful purposes. "The active or immediate objectives," Cain ruled however, "need not, under the Act, be 'bad' or 'evil.' "

This is the ultimate vice of the act. An organization may exist for some useful purpose, like the advancement of old age pensions. The only evidence against it may be activity otherwise protected by freedom of speech, press and assembly. But it must don the yellow badge of registration because it used these basic freedoms to advance what the government regards as views paralleling those of a party the government has decided is subversive, and under circumstances which the government finds shows domination by that subversive party. No matter how you slice this, it is government regulation of politics.

Harry Cain in The Campaign

"They [the Republicans] have talked about civil liberties. But when they found they had put on the Subversive Activities Control Board a man who believes in civil liberties—and who practices what they preach—they go rid of him." *—Stevenson in Albany, Sept. 10*

The assumption is that people cannot be trusted to judge for themselves. The evidence is certainly to the contrary. In this particular case, the Pension Union's membership dwindled from some 40,000 to about 800. Part of that decline was no doubt due to the general atmosphere of fear. But part of it was also due to the fact that many people became fed up with the way the Pension Union was put through the hoops of shifts on political issues which had nothing remotely to do with the fight for pensions.

Men have a right to argue as they please in the political forum, but once let the government decide which are "fronts" or "subversive" and there is no telling who may have to wear the yellow badge of registration.

A future McCarthy utilizing the SACB to proscribe his enemies as "subversive" could operate exactly as Stalin operated in proscribing his critics as "counter-revolutionary." The Internal Security Act reflects the philosophy of government on which absolute monarchs of all kinds, whether Czars, priests or commissars have always depended. It is good that Harry Cain has finally seen this, enlisted fully in the task of teaching these basic American principles anew.

* * *

Nothing so clearly shows the real attitude of the Eisenhower Administration on these fundamental issues than the choice of a nonentity from the Federal Parole Board, Dorothy McCullough Lee, from Portland, Oregon, as Cain's successor. For our part, we welcome the choice. We think it better for the country and its future that the SACB not be dignified by appointing to it persons of stature. .

From the Text of the Interview in Which Cain Finally Cut Loose

"Mr. Cain thinks that the Internal Security Act [setting up a Subversive Activities Control Board] is a radical departure from the American principle that government cannot interfere with free speech. He feels that it makes people hesitate to speak frankly or to join any organization, for fear that the government will some day label it subversive. . . .

"He feels it makes members of proscribed organizations 'second class citizens' and deprives them of the rights to government employment, travel abroad and jobs in defense industries.

"He feels it defies the Fifth Amendment by requiring members of designated groups to brand themselves with a label which will cost them their reputation and maybe their freedom.

"He feels it makes it almost impossible for an organization arraigned by the government to win an 'acquittal' from the Board. . . .

"Mr. Cain has come to believe that any legislation designed to defeat political concepts is dangerous. The proper place to challenge communism, he says, is in the 'marketplace of ideas' not in the courtroom. . . . 'I believe with all my heart,' he says, 'that freedom is indivisible, and that unless we have it for all we shall soon have it only for those with nothing to say. I believe in democracy enough to want to supply a platform to its critics as well as its defenders.' "

—Interview with Daniel M. Berman in Washington Sunday Star, Sept. 2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lucky for Javits He Wasn't "Tried" By Eisenhower-Brownell Security Standards

Can the GOP Campaign As A Peace Party—on The Brink at Suez?

If ever there was a silly offspring, it was the Suez plan aborted at press time by Sir Anthony Eden and reluctantly acknowledged here by its putative parent, Mr. Dulles. Through the bitter eyes of the poor, who live in Africa and Asia, it will seem that the rich whites of America and Europe would rather ruin the Canal than let the Egyptians use its revenues for the improvement of their country. Through the eyes of statesmen like Nehru, it will seem that England and France in their decline have indeed lost their heads. This "users association", acting without consultation except among the three capitals, and after sending off a formal fraudulent little note to make it appear that they had consulted the United Nations, must now add war with Egypt—and perhaps all the Arab countries—to the war they are already waging in Cyprus and Algeria. Public opinion at home will not support them; they can boycott the Canal or make it unusable; they may end by wrecking Nasser, but Eden and Mollet will lose office in the process. The "plan" is attributed by London to Dulles himself and has that shyster quality which marks his handiwork. How will the Republicans campaign as a peace party if Dulles lets London and Paris slide over the brink before November?

Like The Old Gray Mare

The victory of Javits over the snares laid for him by the Eastland-Jenner committee and its counsel, Robert Morris, is a victory for all who have been striving for the restoration of a sane politics in this country. The old Red scare, like the old gray mare, ain't what it used to be. We hope Javits will remember when he reaches the Senate—as we feel sure he will—that had he been an obscure government employe, facing similar allegations under the Eisenhower-Brownell security rules, he would have lost his job, his reputation and his honor. Bella Dodd would have figured in the allegations as an informer whose identity could not be disclosed for security reasons, and he would have been dismissed on the principle that since there was some ground for suspicion, his retention was not "clearly consistent" with the national interest. The G.O.P. system resolves all doubts against the accused.

Why Not Hastie for the Supreme Court?

We pass on to our readers, for whatever pressure they may exert, the news that William H. Denman, the respected chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, has asked the President to appoint a Negro judge, William H. Hastie, to fill the vacancy created by Mr. Justice Minton's retirement. Judge Hastie is qualified by learning, public service and judicial experience. He was dean of Howard University Law School, governor of the Virgin Islands and civilian aide to Henry L. Stimson when the latter was Secretary of War. Judge Hastie was the first Negro ever appointed to the Federal bench, serving first on the District Court and now on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, a post to which he was named by President Truman and in which he has served with distinction. We believe it would derogate from true equality to suggest a candidate because he was a Negro. But Judge Hastie, in attainment and promise, seems to us the worthiest of the candidates so far mentioned. On such a basis, his appointment would mark an historic step forward for his race, and set a moral example of integration at the highest level.

The Shape of Things to Come in the Far East

Those who know how closely geared Brookings Institution has been to the right-of-center in American life will take very seriously the changing attitude toward Communist China in the survey Brookings published last week: *U.S. Foreign Policy 1945-55.* The survey sees the need for an "agonizing reappraisal" of U.S. policy in the Fart East based on the recognition that Communist China has "consolidated and stabilized" its power, and that the U.S. "cannot challenge this power in the Far East without allocating more of its resources than it is prepared to do and . . . on a scale that would limit its capacity to act elsewhere." The survey even dares to ask: "Are the U.S. security pacts with the National Government of China, the Republic of Korea and Japan impediments or aids to reaching an equilibrium?" This is handwriting on the wall for Chiang and Syngman Rhee, and foreshadows serious policy overhaulings after election.

Don't Forget Your Change of Address on Returning from Vacation—It Will Not Be Changed Automatically

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

9/17/56

City .....Zone.....State.....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED